

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated September 4, 2007. Applicants have also filed herewith a three-month extension of time.

Claims 1-11 and 21-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 5-8, 10, 11, 21, 22 and 24 have been currently amended. Claims 12-20 have been currently canceled. New Claim 25 has been added. Claims 5-8, 10, 11, 21, 22 and 24 were amended to remove the multiple dependencies from each claim, and to correct spelling. Support for amended Claim 1 can be found on pages 3 and 13 of the specification. Support for new Claim 25 can be found on page 3 of the specification. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by the amended and new claims.

The specification was amended, as shown above, to provide a paragraph on related applications. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this amendment to the specification.

In regard to the Examiner's comment in item 8 of the present Office Action, Applicants note that, as recited in Claim 1, the non-foamed polymer layer comprises the following: (a) a polymer comprising units derived from a 1-alkene monomer Thus, the polymer comprises this monomer, and, optionally, other monomers (see also page 12, lines 1-4, of the present application).

In regard to the Examiner's objection to Claims 6-11 and 19-24, Applicants have canceled Claims 19 and 20, rendering the objection to these claims moot. As discussed above, Applicants have amended Claims 6-8, 10, 11, 21, 22 and 24, to remove the multiple dependencies from each claim, and thus obviated this objection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 and 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b), as anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), as obvious over, JP 2001-226509 (hereinafter the JP509 reference). Applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

The JP509 reference does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed. This reference teaches that its foam resin sheets may contain an inorganic filler at 5 weight

percent of the weight as a limit (see paragraph [0043]). Thus, the JP509 reference teaches away from a foam resin sheet containing more than 5 weight percent filler.

For at least these reasons, the JP509 reference does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, 14, 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b), as anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), as obvious over, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0035164 (hereinafter the '164 publication). Applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

The '164 publication does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed. This publication is primarily directed to rigid foam polypropylene sheet (for example, see abstract and paragraph [0013]). This publication teaches, in one embodiment, that a sheet may have a very thin surface layer having a thickness to core thickness ratio of 1/1000, and preferably 1/2000 (see paragraph [0057]). All of the examples are monolayer foams, which fall outside the scope of the pending claims. In addition, Examples 7-12 (see Table IV) have grammage values ranging from 543 g/m² to 891 g/m², which are also outside the scope of the pending claims. For these examples, the grammage can be determined by multiplying the density of the foam by the foam thickness, and correcting for the proper units. For example, the grammage of Example 7, is determined from the following equation: $0.65 \text{ g/cm}^3 \times 0.89 \text{ mm} \times 1 \text{ cm}/10 \text{ mm} \times 10^4 \text{ cm}^2/\text{m}^2 = 578 \text{ g/m}^2$.

For at least these reasons, the '164 publication does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected Claims 3, 4, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), as unpatentable over the '164 publication, in view of the JP509 reference. Applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

As discussed above, the '164 publication does not teach or suggest pending Claim 1. The JP506 reference does not overcome the deficiencies of the '164 publication. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the '164 publication, in view of the

JP509 reference, does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed. Applicants request the withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 and 12-18, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,364,988 (hereinafter the '988 patent), in view of the JP509 reference. Applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

The '988 patent does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed. The '988 patent is directed to a three-layer co-extrusion synthetic paper with a thickness from 25 μm to 250 μm (for example, see Abstract, Title of Invention, Field of Invention, Summary of Invention, table shown on column 6, and Embodiments 1-3). Thus, the '988 patent requires a paper thickness from 25 to 250 μm , and teaches away from paper thicknesses outside this range. In addition, the grammage for each of the experimental papers of the embodiments (see column 7 to column 10) approximately ranges from about 42 g/m^2 to about 91 g/m^2 , which is outside the claimed invention. Grammage can be approximated by equating the specific gravity to the density of the paper, and multiplying the density by the paper thickness, and correcting for the appropriate units. For example, the grammage of the 60 μm paper of Embodiment 1 would be determined as follows: $0.70 \text{ g}/\text{cm}^3 \times 60 \mu\text{m} \times 1 \text{ cm}/10^4 \mu\text{m} \times 10^4 \text{ cm}^2/\text{m}^2 = 42 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$. It is believed that the unit for the "basis weight," as disclosed for the paper samples of the three embodiments, is incorrectly shown as " g/cm^2 ," and should be " g/m^2 ."

Thus, the '988 patent does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed, and the JP509 reference does not overcome the deficiencies of the '988 patent. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the '988 patent, in view of the JP509 reference, does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed. Applicants request the withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present amendment is now in condition for allowance, and request notice of such action. If further issues remain, Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

Date: March 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Jane M. Terry/

Jane M. Terry
Registration No. 53,682
Phone: 979-238-3424

P. O. Box 1967
Midland, MI 48641-1967

JMT/llb